


MARK THIS BALLOT
AND TAKE IT WITH
YOU TO YOUR
POLLING PLACE



★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

OFFICIAL SAMPLE BALLOT

AND VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

FILE COPY
DONOT REMOVE

COMPILED BY ELIAS MARTINEZ, CITY CLERK

PRIMARY NOMINATING AND
★ CONSOLIDATED ELECTIONS ★
TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1993

210

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Primary Nominating and Consolidated Elections — April 20, 1993
(MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE CITY CLERK BY APRIL 13, 1993)
For Absent Voter Information Call (213) 485-4615

210

PRINT
Registered
Name and
Address

First Name M.I. Last Name

Number & Street

City

Zip Code

Phone No.

Signature
of Applicant

X

If you want your ballot mailed to an address different from your
registered address, please indicate below.

Street

City

State

Zip Code

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ELECTION DIVISION
ROOM 2300, CITY HALL
200 N. SPRING STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
City of Los Angeles
Election Division

★ LOCATION OF ★
YOUR VOTING PLACE



FILE COPY
DONOT REMOVE

Under federal law, the City's Official Sample Ballot
is available in the following languages:

如果您需要中文的選票，請打電話到
1-800-994-VOTE (8683)

日本語の市公式サンプル投票用紙をご希望の方は
1-800-994-VOTE(8683)までにご連絡ください。

Si Ud. desea obtener una copia de la boleta en español,
por favor llame al teléfono 1-800-994-VOTE (8683)

Kung kailangang ninyo ang kopya ng balota sa Tagalog,
tumawag po lamang sa 1-800-994-VOTE (8683)

Nếu quý vị cần phiếu bầu cử Việt Ngữ, xin gọi
1-800-994-VOTE (8683)

Under City of Los Angeles law, the City's Official
Sample Ballot is available in the following language:

한국말로 된 시의 공식샘플 투표용지를 원하시는
분은 1-800-994-VOTE(8683)에 연락해 주십시오.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING	2
SAMPLE BALLOT	4
BALLOT DIGEST	
Simplified Version	18
BALLOT MEASURES	
Ordinance Proposition 1	28
Charter Amendment 2.....	40
Charter Amendment 3.....	48
Charter Amendment 4.....	52
Charter Amendment 5.....	62
INSTRUCTIONS FOR	
ABSENT VOTER APPLICATION	72
ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION	Back Cover

THE LOCATION OF YOUR
POLLING PLACE
IS SHOWN ON BACK
COVER

POLLS OPEN AT 7 A.M.
AND CLOSE AT 8 P.M.

SAMPLE BALLOT
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
PRIMARY NOMINATING AND
CONSOLIDATED ELECTIONS
APRIL 20, 1993

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

Punch ballot cards with punching device attached to vote recorder. Do not use pen or pencil.

To vote for a candidate of your choice, punch the ballot card in the hole next to that candidate's name and number. Vote for only one candidate for each office. To vote for a person not on the ballot, write both the title of the office and the candidate's name in the blank space left for that purpose on the gray write-in envelope.


All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void. If you wrongly punch, tear or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the gray write-in envelope, return it to the precinct inspector and obtain another.

**MARK YOUR CHOICES IN THIS PAMPHLET AND
TAKE IT WITH YOU TO YOUR POLLING PLACE**


VOTING INSTRUCTIONS

**REMOVE BALLOT CARD
FROM GRAY ENVELOPE**


Step 1. Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Vote Recorder.




Step 2. Be sure the two slots in the end of your card fit down over the two red pins.



Step 3. To vote, hold the voting instrument straight down and punch through the ballot card. Do not use pen or pencil. Vote all pages.



Step 4. After voting, remove the ballot card from the Vote Recorder. Remove any hanging paper chads from the back of card.



**PUT BALLOT CARD BACK
IN GRAY ENVELOPE**

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

MAYOR Vote for One	RICHARD KATZ Member, State Assembly	3	▶○
	TED HAYES, JR. Homeless Activist/Advocate	4	▶○
	TOM HOUSTON Environmental Attorney	5	▶○
	NATE HOLDEN City Councilmember	6	▶○
	EILEEN ANDERSON Singer-Dancer Candidate	7	▶○
	KIM ALLEN Railroad Worker	8	▶○
	PHILIP ASHAMALLAH Engineer-Composer-Songwriter	9	▶○
	FRANK TERAN Property Investor, Retired	10	▶○
	ERNANI BERNARDI Los Angeles City Councilman	11	▶○
	ADAM BREGMAN Writer, Musician, Activist	12	▶○
	JOHN Z. BORUNDA Businessman/Police (Ret)	13	▶○
	RICHARD J. RIORDAN Businessman, Civic Leader	14	▶○
	JULIAN NAVA Educator-Diplomat-Businessman	15	▶○
	DOUGLAS CARLTON	16	▶○
	"MELROSE" LARRY GREEN Tax Preparer/Actor	17	▶○
	LINDA GRIEGO Deputy Mayor/Businesswoman	18	▶○
	MICHAEL ADAM LEPTUCH	19	▶○
	LEONARD SHAPIRO Publisher	20	▶○
	STAN SANDERS Businessman	21	▶○
	JOEL WACHS Member of the City Council	22	▶○
	MIKE WOO Urban Planner-Councilmember	23	▶○
	OSCAR C. VALDES Medical Doctor	24	▶○
	NICK PATSAOURAS Businessman/Transportation Commissioner	25	▶○
	RANDY MARK PAVELKO Taxi Driver	26	▶○



CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CITY ATTORNEY

Vote for One

JAMES KENNETH HAHN
City Attorney29 ☒MICHAEL GUARINO
Prosecutor30 ☒

CONTROLLER

Vote for One

KAHILL KAHILL
Engineer, Financial Management33 ☒RICK TUTTLE
Controller, City of Los Angeles34 ☒KEVIN JONES
Fabricator/Assembly35 ☒

CITY OF LOS ANGELES**MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL, 7th DISTRICT**

Vote for One

LYLE E. HALL Los Angeles Fire Captain	55	▶	○
RICHARD ANTHONY ALARCON Valley Services Coordinator	56	▶	○
RAY MAGANA Attorney	57	▶	○
LEROY CHASE Executive Director/Administrator	58	▶	○
ROSE CASTANEDA Congressional Chief Deputy	59	▶	○
AL DIB Businessman	60	▶	○
ANNE FINN Community Advocate-Businesswoman	61	▶	○
HENRY REYES VILLAFANA Teacher/Accountant	62	▶	○



4

406

CITY OF LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL BALLOT
Primary Nominating and Consolidated Elections
Tuesday, April 20, 1993

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, 6th DISTRICT

Vote for One

LYNNE KUZNETSKY Educator/Teacher/Counselor	81	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JULIE KORENSTEIN Member of the Board of Education	82	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ELI BRENT School Principal	83	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RICHARD (RICK) BIEBER Electrical Contractor, Activist	84	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



CITY OF LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL BALLOT
Primary Nominating and Consolidated Elections
Tuesday, April 20, 1993

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, OFFICE NO. 2	Vote for One
JOSH ADDISON ARCE High School Student	107 <input type="radio"/>
MARIA ESCALANTE Educator	108 <input type="radio"/>
ERIC C. JACOBSON Editor	109 <input type="radio"/>
JOSEPH ORTIZ Educator/Communications Specialist	110 <input type="radio"/>
GABRIEL A. OROSCO Community Activist	111 <input type="radio"/>
PAT OWENS Community College Trustee	112 <input type="radio"/>
ELIZABETH "BETH" GARFIELD College Lecturer/Attorney	113 <input type="radio"/>
RONALD RAY WILLIAMS Student/Business Major	114 <input type="radio"/>

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, OFFICE NO. 4	Vote for One
XAVIER HERMOSILLO Business Owner/Parent	117 <input type="radio"/>
LINDSAY CONNER Member of the Board of Trustees	118 <input type="radio"/>
CASEY PETERS University Library Worker	119 <input type="radio"/>

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, OFFICE NO. 6	Vote for One
PETER C. HALT Certified Public Accountant	122 <input type="radio"/>
ALTHEA BAKER Community College Trustee	123 <input type="radio"/>
FERNANDO DEL RIO Communications Manager	124 <input type="radio"/>
ALICE HILDA LANE Community Political Consultant	125 <input type="radio"/>
STANLEY CAMILLA VILTZ Community College Administrator	126 <input type="radio"/>



LOS ANGELES CITY MEASURES

- 1** **HIRING 1,000 ADDITIONAL POLICE OFFICERS TO HELP IMPLEMENT THE CHRISTOPHER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING; CREATION OF DEDICATED FUND FOR ASSOCIATED COSTS THROUGH A SPECIAL TAX. ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1.**

YES 135 ☒ ☐

NO 136 ☒ ☐

Shall the people adopt an ordinance to add 1,000 uniformed officers throughout the entire city, to expand community-based policing, strengthen anti-gang violence measures, create dedicated trust fund for costs with a levy upon parcels and improvements commencing with fiscal year 1993-94?

- 2** **TWO-TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS FOR TERMS STARTING ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 1993. CHARTER AMENDMENT 2.**

YES 140 ☒ ☐

NO 141 ☒ ☐

Shall the City of Los Angeles Charter be amended to provide that the Mayor, City Attorney, Controller and members of the City Council shall each be limited to two terms of office, for terms starting on or after July 1, 1993?

- 3** **FIRE AND POLICE PENSION SYSTEMS. CHARTER AMENDMENT 3.**

YES 144 ☒ ☐

NO 145 ☒ ☐

Shall the Charter be amended to permit the recall of retired Los Angeles Police Officers to active duty without loss of pension for a period not to exceed 12 months, the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment for such recalled members to be established by ordinance?

- 4** **INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT — TWO-TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS. CHARTER AMENDMENT 4.**

YES 149 ☒ ☐

NO 150 ☒ ☐

Shall the City of Los Angeles Charter be amended to provide that the Mayor, City Attorney, Controller and members of the City Council shall each be limited to two terms of office, for terms starting on or after July 1, 1993, except that an incumbent Councilmember whose office is not on the ballot in 1993 could serve only one additional term?

- 5** **CHANGE IN THE AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD OF ANIMAL REGULATION COMMISSIONERS. CHARTER AMENDMENT 5.**

YES 153 ☒ ☐

NO 154 ☒ ☐

Shall the Charter be amended to change the Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners from an advisory board to a board which operates as the head of the Department of Animal Regulation?

END OF BALLOT

**VOTER
INFORMATION
PAMPHLET**

ON

BALLOT MEASURES 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

COMPILED BY
ELIAS MARTINEZ, CITY CLERK
KRISTIN F. HEFFRON,
CHIEF MANAGEMENT ANALYST

The next 10 pages contain simplified versions of City ballot measures. The full text of each measure, along with other information, is printed after the Ballot Digest (see TABLE OF CONTENTS Page).

ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1

TITLE:

Special Police Tax

THE ISSUE:

Should the City be allowed to charge property owners a special tax for hiring up to 1,000 additional police officers?

THE SITUATION:

The City currently provides funding for 7,900 police officers. The Christopher Commission recommended that the Los Angeles Police Department be increased in order to place more officers in the community.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would allow the City to charge a special tax to hire up to 1,000 additional police officers over a 5-year period.

This tax could be imposed only in years in which the City funds and employs at least 7,900 police officers from the regular budget. Money from this tax could be used only for additional officers and related costs, including civilian employees necessary to support new officers.

Police officers paid for by this tax would be assigned to uniformed, detective, narcotics or anti-gang duties.

This special tax would be imposed on residential and business properties. The amount of tax would be based on the size of the buildings and improvements on the property. Vacant land, regardless of size, would be taxed as if it had 500 square feet of improvements.

The maximum annual tax for 1993-94 is estimated to be \$4.89 for each 100 square feet of improvement. For example, the owner of a 1,500 square foot home, including the garage, would pay about \$73 each year. The tax would be adjusted annually based on changes in the cost of living.

This measure will become law only if 2/3 of the voters approve it.

ARGUMENT FOR:

Fighting crime must be our top priority. In 1992, there were 1,095 murders in our City. Currently, we do not have enough police to protect us. Los Angeles has the fewest officers per resident of the six largest US cities.

Things will only get worse unless we do something. You or a loved one may be the next victim. We should support our police by approving this tax.

The 1,000 officers added by this measure will patrol the streets in our neighborhoods and make us safer. They will not be working at desks.

The cost will be spread fairly among all property owners. The average homeowner will pay only about \$73 a year. Proposition 1 will help our police officers do their job. Your family's safety depends on it.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

The cost of this measure is unfair to property owners. Some people will face a hardship paying this tax.

The cost is unfair to City residents. People who work in Los Angeles but do not live here will get additional police protection for free. The cost should be paid by everyone who benefits.

This is the wrong time to vote to raise taxes because other taxes will be raised soon without your permission.

These new tax funds will just allow other police funds to be used for non-police purposes. The Police Department's share of the regular City budget will probably be reduced in a few years.

The Chief of Police should reorganize the department to put more officers on the street.

If the City Council made the Police Department a top priority, we could have more officers on the street without raising taxes.

A YES VOTE MEANS:

You want to allow the City to charge property owners a special tax to pay for hiring up to 1,000 additional police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS:

You do not want to allow the City to charge property owners a special tax to pay for hiring up to 1,000 additional police officers.

THE FULL TEXT OF THIS MEASURE BEGINS ON PAGE 35.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

TITLE:

Term Limits (Council Proposal)

THE ISSUE:

Should a two-term limit be placed on all future elected City officials, with those now holding office eligible for re-election for two additional terms?

THE SITUATION:

The Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller, and the 15 Members of the City Council are elected to serve 4-year terms. The Mayor, City Attorney, and City Controller are elected Citywide. One Council member is elected from each of the 15 Council Districts.

Elections for Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller, and eight of the 15 Council offices are being held in 1993. Elections for the other seven Council offices will be held at the next City elections in 1995.

Currently, there is no limit on the number of times a person could be elected to the same City office.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would limit the number of times a person could be elected to the same City office. Beginning July 1, 1993, no one would be allowed to hold the same office for more than two 4-year terms. Those currently holding office would be eligible for re-election for two additional terms.

This measure is similar to Charter Amendment 4 on this ballot. If both Charter Amendment 2 and Charter Amendment 4 are approved by the voters, the one receiving the highest number of yes votes will become law.

ARGUMENT FOR:

Term limits are one way to clean up government. But they must be applied fairly to all citizens.

Council members did not vote for term limits because they felt citizens should have the right to make their own decisions about candidates. The Council put this measure on the ballot only to make sure term limits would be applied fairly to all elected officials.

This measure will not divide our elected officials into two classes like Charter Amendment 4.

Term limits should be fair. This is the only measure which applies term limits fairly.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

Last July, the City Council was asked three times to put a term limit measure on the ballot. They refused. While the City Council did nothing for 6 months, a citizens' group collected a record 306,000 signatures to place a term limit initiative on the ballot.

Then the City Council politicians wrote their own weaker Charter Amendment so it looked like they supported term limits. The City Council Charter Amendment is designed to confuse voters and delay term limits for half of the City Council.

If you want term limits, vote No on Charter Amendment 2, the politicians' measure, and Yes on Charter Amendment 4, the people's measure.

A YES VOTE MEANS:

A yes vote means you want a two-term limit placed on all future elected City officials, with those now holding office eligible for re-election for two additional terms.

A NO VOTE MEANS:

A no vote means you do not want a two-term limit placed on all future elected City officials, with those now holding office eligible for re-election for two additional terms.

THE FULL TEXT OF THIS MEASURE BEGINS ON PAGE 47.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 3

TITLE:

Recall of Retired Police Officers

THE ISSUE:

Should the Chief of Police be allowed to recall retired police officers for up to 12 months of paid voluntary active duty during which time they would continue to receive their monthly pension payments?

THE SITUATION:

The Charter currently allows the Chief of Police to recall retired police officers to voluntary paid active duty under the following conditions:

- a. Officers can only be rehired at the rank they held when they retired;
- b. Officers cannot be rehired for more than 90 days in any one year; and
- c. Officers continue to receive their police pension payments during this rehire period.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would allow the Chief of Police to recall retired officers to paid active duty for periods of more than 90 days and up to 12 months. During that time the recalled officers would continue to receive their monthly police pension payment. The City Council and the Mayor would decide the salary, benefits, and rules which apply to these recalled officers.

ARGUMENT FOR:

The Los Angeles Police Department has lost well qualified and experienced police officers to early retirement. Charter Amendment 3 will allow the City to rehire these police officers to active duty for as long as 12 months.

Police Officers are trained at great expense to taxpayers. These experienced officers often choose to leave when we need them the most. We need well-trained police officers who are experienced in fighting gang violence, catching drug dealers, and making our streets and communities safe.

This Charter Amendment will give the City the chance to rehire retired police officers at a great savings to the taxpayers.

Crime is going up, not down. Rehiring retired officers will help correct the problem of rising crime.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

(None submitted)

A YES VOTE MEANS:

A yes vote means you want to allow the Chief of Police to recall retired police officers for up to 12 months of paid voluntary active duty during which time they would continue to receive their monthly pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS:

A no vote means you do not want to allow the Chief of Police to recall retired police officers for up to 12 months of paid voluntary active duty during which time they would continue to receive their monthly pension payments.

THE FULL TEXT OF THIS MEASURE BEGINS ON PAGE 50.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

TITLE:

Term Limits (Initiative)

THE ISSUE:

Should a two-term limit be placed on future elected City officials with current office holders eligible for re-election in 1993 limited to two additional terms in office, and those eligible for re-election in 1995 limited to one additional term?

THE SITUATION:

The Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller, and the 15 Members of the City Council are elected to serve 4-year terms. The Mayor, City Attorney, and City Controller are elected Citywide. One Council member is elected from each of the 15 Council Districts.

Elections for Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller and eight of the 15 Council offices are being held in 1993. Elections for the other seven Council offices will be held at the next City elections in 1995.

Currently, there is no limit on the number of times a person could be elected to the same City office.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would limit the number of times a person could be elected to the same City office. Beginning July 1, 1993, no one would be allowed to hold the same office for more than two 4-year terms.

Under this measure, the Citywide officers and Council members whose current terms expire in 1993 would be eligible for re-election for two additional terms. Council members whose current terms expire in 1995 would be eligible for re-election for only one additional term.

This measure is similar to Charter Amendment 2 on this ballot. If both Charter Amendment 2 and Charter Amendment 4 are approved by the voters, the one receiving the highest number of yes votes will become law.

ARGUMENT FOR:

More than 95% of elected officials are re-elected because they are able to raise money from special interest groups and get their names in the newspapers. The system does not give enough talented people a chance to participate in government. This measure will stop us from having career politicians and begin an era of the citizen-politician.

The City Council did not want to put term limits on the ballot because it would reduce their power. After a citizens' group put term limits on the ballot, the Council wrote their own measure. But it does not go far enough because it delays term limits for half the City Council. This measure will bring reform to City Hall and build a better Los Angeles.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

Charter Amendment 4 and City Council's term limit measure seem the same, but Charter Amendment 4 is not fair and should be rejected.

Charter Amendment 4 would limit current office holders in the even-numbered Council districts to one more term. Those in odd-numbered council districts would have the opportunity for two more terms. This measure does not make good sense and is not a way to get political reform. All Council members would not be treated the same.

New laws changing the way campaigns are financed have not had a chance to work. Future elections should be fair to all candidates. Whether you agree or disagree with term limits, this measure is not good policy.

A YES VOTE MEANS:

A yes vote means you want a two-term limit placed on future elected City officials with current office holders eligible for re-election in 1993 limited to two additional terms in office, and those eligible for re-election in 1995 limited to one additional term.

A NO VOTE MEANS:

A no vote means you do not want a two-term limit placed on future elected City officials with current office holders eligible for re-election in 1993 limited to two additional terms in office, and those eligible for re-election in 1995 limited to one additional term.

THE FULL TEXT OF THIS MEASURE BEGINS ON PAGE 61.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 5

TITLE:

Animal Regulation Commission

THE ISSUE:

Should the City's Animal Regulation Commission be changed from an advisory commission to one that operates as head of the Animal Regulation Department?

THE SITUATION:

The City's Animal Regulation Department maintains the City's animal shelters. It enforces laws regarding cruelty to animals and collects animal license fees.

Currently, the City's Animal Regulation Department is under the control and management of the Department's General Manager. The General Manager is selected under civil service rules. The Mayor appoints and may remove the General Manager, with the approval of the City Council.

The five-member Animal Regulation Commission is part-time and advisory only. Its members are appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the City Council.

THE PROPOSAL:

This measure would make the Animal Regulation Commission the head of the Animal Regulation Department. The General Manager would be appointed by the Commission and could be removed by the Commission.

ARGUMENT FOR:

For over 20 years, City management has run our animal shelters into the ground. Instead of saving animals, they kill them. Charter Amendment 5 will end this poor treatment of animals and poor management of the Animal Regulation Department.

This measure will give a citizen commission control over the Animal Regulation Department to make sure its employees do their job and do it right. The citizen commission will review and oversee the policies and operations of the Animal Regulation Department and let the professionals do their job.

This measure will end needless animal killing. It will correct the abuses of the last 20 years.

ARGUMENT AGAINST:

This measure would change the management of the Animal Regulation Department from a professional manager to a part-time citizen board.

Today, the Mayor, with the approval of the City Council, appoints the General Manager who runs the Department. The citizen commissioners are an advisory board.

Under this measure, the General Manager would be appointed by the part-time commissioners and be subject to their instructions.

In 1965, the Animal Regulation Department and several other departments were put under management of a General Manager. This was done to improve operations and better serve the public. This measure is a step backward. The General Manager should be under the control of the Mayor and City Council. This system protects us and makes our City government strong.

A YES VOTE MEANS:

A yes vote means you want to change the City's Animal Regulation Commission from an advisory commission to one that operates as head of the Animal Regulation Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS:

A no vote means you do not want to change the City's Animal Regulation Commission from an advisory commission to one that operates as head of the Animal Regulation Department.

THE FULL TEXT OF THIS MEASURE BEGINS ON PAGE 68.

1

**HIRING 1,000 ADDITIONAL POLICE OFFICERS TO
HELP IMPLEMENT THE CHRISTOPHER COMMISSION
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED
POLICING; CREATION OF DEDICATED FUND FOR
ASSOCIATED COSTS THROUGH A SPECIAL TAX.
ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1.**

Shall the people adopt an ordinance to add 1,000 uniformed officers throughout the entire city, to expand community-based policing, strengthen anti-gang violence measures, create dedicated trust fund for costs with a levy upon parcels and improvements commencing with fiscal year 1993-94?

IMPARTIAL SUMMARY

BY WILLIAM R. MCCARLEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

This measure would impose a special tax on real property in the City of Los Angeles to finance 1,000 new police officer positions and the necessary supporting civilian personnel, equipment and related expenses.

The Los Angeles Police Department is currently authorized to employ 7,900 police officers. If approved, this tax would provide enough funds to pay for an additional 1,000 sworn officers increasing the total police force to 8,900 officers.

This measure specifically provides that these 1,000 additional officers would have to be assigned to uniformed, detective, narcotics and anti-gang activities, and could only be employed at the ranks of police officer, sergeant, and detective. Assigning these officers to these areas will help implement the community-based policing recommendations contained in the report of the Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department, commonly referred to as "The Christopher Commission." The additional officers would be phased in over a five year period with approximately 200 of the new positions added in each of those five years.

The measure would require the City Council to annually adopt a tax rate sufficient to pay the costs of the additional police protection authorized by this measure. However, this measure specifies that the maximum tax rate for the first year, fiscal 1993-94, could be no more than \$4.89 per 100 square feet of improvement. That maximum rate would be adjusted each year based on changes in the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles area.

This measure would require the City to fund at least 7,900 police officer positions from other City revenues before this tax could be imposed. The tax could not be collected in any year in which the City does not fund at least 7,900 police officer positions from other City revenues.

For each parcel of improved property, the annual tax would be computed by multiplying the tax rate by the gross square footage of the

improvements located on the parcel. For each unimproved parcel, the annual tax would be based on 500 square feet of improvements, regardless of the size of the parcel. Parcels owned by organizations which are exempt from federal income tax, such as non-profit organizations, would be exempt from the proposed tax. This tax also establishes a method to correct errors in the computation of the tax and establishes a refund procedure.

All taxes collected under this measure would be placed in a Special Police Tax Fund and could only be used to pay for these increased police services. This special tax will only become law if two-thirds of the voters approve.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BY KEITH COMRIE, CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This measure provides for the funding of 1,000 additional police officers and related support staffing and equipment. Funding will be through a special tax on real property at a rate not to exceed \$4.89 per 100 square feet of improvements. This maximum rate may be adjusted annually to reflect any changes in the cost of living. The projected maximum annual cost, before inflationary adjustments, on a typical house of 1,500 square feet will be \$73. The tax will be lower on smaller houses and higher on other buildings such as larger houses, apartment buildings, and commercial and industrial buildings. The estimated annual cost of this measure after all positions have been filled, exclusive of inflationary adjustments, is \$101,488,000. This special tax cannot be levied in any year the City does not fund and employ at least the currently authorized 7,900 regular police officer positions.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1

Fighting crime must be our highest priority in Los Angeles. In 1992, a frightening 1,095 people were murdered on our streets. We have too few police to protect us. In fact, Los Angeles has the fewest officers per resident of the six largest American cities.

Unless we do something, things will only get worse, and you or a loved one may be the next victim.

There is something we can do. We can support our police and vote for Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 will add 1,000 more officers to our police force. Police Chief Williams has pledged that all of these additional officers will go into uniformed assignments, patrolling the streets in our neighborhoods, and not working as administrators.

The cost of these officers will be spread fairly among commercial, industrial and residential property. Proposition 1 would be balanced and evenhanded.

Under Proposition 1, the owner of an average home will get safer streets, stronger drug law enforcement and greater protection from street gangs for \$73 a year. It's not even possible to install an alarm system in a home or business for that amount.

Having an additional 1,000 officers patrolling our neighborhoods will make us safer when we walk our streets.

Proposition 1 will help our police officers do the job we pay them for. Please join with law enforcement and civic leaders in voting "YES" on Proposition 1. Your family's safety depends on it.

WILLIE L. WILLIAMS
Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department

MARVIN BRAUDE
Chairman
Public Safety Committee
Los Angeles City Council

GIL GARCETTI
District Attorney
Los Angeles County

EDWARD M. DAVIS
Former Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department

REV. CECIL L. MURRAY
Senior Minister
First A.M.E. Church

DEP. CHIEF MARK A. KROEKER
Commanding Officer
Operations Valley Bureau
Los Angeles Police Department

ADDITIONAL PERSONS SIGNING ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1

RICHARD H. CLOSE
President
Sherman Oaks Homeowners
Association

GLORIA MOLINA
Los Angeles County Supervisor
1st District

MIKE HERNANDEZ
Chairman
Administrative Services Committee
Los Angeles City Council

JOHN FERRARO
President
Los Angeles City Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1

YES, WE NEED MORE POLICE OFFICERS . . . BUT,

THIS PROPERTY TAX IS A FRAUD. It's nothing more than a way to get you to pay more taxes while your leaders waste your money on their pet projects.

If Proposition 1 sponsors really believed more police were so critical **WHY DID THEY REPEATEDLY REDUCE THE POLICE PORTION OF THE BUDGET?**

Since 1983 the allocation for the Police Department was **REDUCED** by almost 27%.

That's right, in 1983 the Police budget represented 65% of the total budget. Today it represents only 39%. During that time the Mayor and Council increased other city agencies and created many new unnecessary bureaucracies.

If your leaders are sincere in their concerns for your safety, let them do their jobs by providing you with more Police protection . . . **WITHOUT MORE TAXES.**

If they won't, we'll **FORCE** them to do it with a charter amendment.

HAL BERNSON
Councilmember
12th District

ERNANI BERNARDI
Councilmember
7th District

JOEL FOX
President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers
Association

YALE GOODMAN
Property Tax Rebate Service

DON SCHULTZ
President
Van Nuys Homeowners
Association

HARRY GODLEY
Chairman
Chatsworth Homeowners
Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1

VOTE NO!

1. The cost is unfair to property owners. Square footage of one's home does not directly relate to one's income or ability to pay. **OWNERS OF LESSER VALUE HOMES (PROBABLY SENIORS OR YOUNG COUPLES) WILL FACE UNDUE HARDSHIP PAYING THE TAX.**

2. The cost is unfair to Los Angeles residents. Hundreds of thousands of non-Angelenos work in the City of Los Angeles. They will not pay one penny for more police if this tax passes. Only those of us who live in the City will pay. **THE COST OF MORE POLICE SHOULD BE PAID BY EVERYONE WHO BENEFITS FROM THEM.**

3. Now is **NOT THE TIME** to raise your own taxes voluntarily. Despite the recession, the state and national governments will soon raise your taxes involuntarily. Why increase our mutual burden?

4. Like the State Lottery scheme which promised greater funds for education, but ended up just increasing the general fund, these new "extra" police funds will just allow other police funds to be used for non-police purposes. In a few years, **A SMALLER PROPORTION OF THE CITY'S ANNUAL BUDGET PROBABLY WILL GO TO POLICE SERVICES THAN NOW ARE ALLOCATED FOR THEM.**

5. We could always use more police. However, it is the responsibility of our Police Chief to **REORGANIZE HIS OVER 10,000 PERSONNEL** in a way that will put more patrolmen on the street.

6. It is the responsibility of the City Council to prioritize City spending. We now are being asked to vote on issues that should be dealt with at the City Council level. We can have **MORE PATROLMEN ON THE STREET AND NOT RAISE TAXES.**

VOTE NO! THIS TAX IS UNFAIR, UNTIMELY AND INAPPROPRIATE.

YALE GOODMAN
President
Property Tax Rebate Service

JOEL FOX
President
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers
Association

TREVOR A. GRIMM
Secretary
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers
Association

ERNANI BERNARDI
Councilmember
7th District

HAL BERNSON
Councilmember
12th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

**REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST
PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1**

Proposition 1 will give Los Angeles 1,000 desperately needed additional police officers.

Los Angeles has fewer police officers per resident than any major American city. We cannot be safe in our homes, on our streets or in our schools without an adequate-sized police force.

Our streets are terrorized by shootings, carjackings, muggings, gangs, drug dealers and over 1,000 murders in 1992. No neighborhood is safe.

We have a right not to live in fear.

Nay-sayers who claim money for more police is available elsewhere in the budget are only fooling voters. If we really want more police we must be willing to pay for them — about \$6 a month for the typical homeowner.

Proposition 1 is a small price to pay for the basic protection we all need.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 1.

WILLIE L. WILLIAMS
Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department

MARVIN BRAUDE
Chairman
Public Safety Committee
Los Angeles City Council

GIL GARCETTI
District Attorney
Los Angeles County

CHARLES A. LABROW
President
Los Angeles Police
Command Officers Association

REV. CECIL L. MURRAY
Senior Minister
First A.M.E. Church

DEP. CHIEF MARK A. KROEKER
Commanding Officer
Operations Valley Bureau
Los Angeles Police Department

RICHARD H. CLOSE
President
Sherman Oaks Homeowners
Association

GLORIA MOLINA
Los Angeles County Supervisor
1st District

SHARYN ROMANO
President
Holly Drive Owners Association

EDWARD M. DAVIS
Former Chief of Police
Los Angeles Police Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

**ORDINANCE PROPOSITION 1
PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION ON HIRING
1,000 ADDITIONAL POLICE OFFICERS TO HELP IMPLEMENT
THE CHRISTOPHER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING; CREATION OF DEDICATED FUND
FOR ASSOCIATED COSTS THROUGH A SPECIAL TAX**

An ordinance adding Article 1.17 to Chapter II of the Los Angeles Municipal Code imposing a Special Police Tax, subject to the approval of two-thirds of the voters voting upon the proposal within the City of Los Angeles.

**THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. Article 1.17 is hereby added to Chapter II of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to read as follows:

**ARTICLE 1.17
SPECIAL POLICE TAX**

SEC. 21.17.1. DEFINITIONS.

The following words and phrases whenever used in this Article shall be construed as defined in this Section:

(a) "Parcel" shall mean a unit of real property as shown on the last equalized assessment roll of Los Angeles County.

(b) "Improvements to property" shall mean buildings or other improvements erected on or affixed to a parcel.

(c) "Buildings" shall mean any structures having a roof supported by columns or walls, for the housing, shelter or enclosure of persons, animals, chattels or property of any kind.

SEC. 21.17.2. EXEMPTIONS.

(a) Nothing in this Article shall be construed as imposing a tax upon any person when imposition of such tax upon that person would be in violation of either the Constitutions of the United States or the State of California.

(b) The tax imposed by this Article shall not be levied upon the federal government, the state government, any state agency, or any local governmental agency.

(c) The tax imposed by this Article shall not be levied upon a parcel of property or improvement which is owned and used by an organization described in Sections 501(c), 501(d) or 401(a) of Title 26 of the United States Code. All sections of the United States Code shall mean those sections as they exist on the effective date of this Article and as they may be amended thereafter.

SEC. 21.17.3. SPECIAL POLICE TAX.

(a) There is hereby imposed a special tax on each parcel, improvement to property, and the use of property within the City of Los Angeles to finance additional police protection. The special tax shall be for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year 1993-94.

(b) This tax is enacted under the authority of Subdivision (d) of Subsection (11) of Section 2 of Article I of the Los Angeles City Charter, other authority held as a Charter City, and, independently thereof, under the authority of California Government Code Sections 53970-53979 and California Government Code Sections 50075-50077.5.

SEC. 21.17.4. PURPOSE.

(a) The purpose of this Special Police Tax is to finance the employment of up to 1,000 additional police officers and the civilian personnel, equipment and expenses required to support them. To this end, the revenues from the tax must be used to finance the costs of an increase of up to 1,000 authorized regular police officer positions no higher in pay than the highest pay grade of the civil service classification of Police Detective or Sergeant, from the current authorization of 7,900, up to 8,900, to increase the number of personnel in support thereof accordingly, and for related equipment and expenses.

(b) The additional police officers shall be assigned to uniformed, detective, narcotics, anti-gang enforcement duties and in accordance with the recommendations of the Christopher Commission to implement community based policing. The employment of the up to 1,000 additional police officers shall be accomplished over a five year period at the rate of approximately 200 positions per year and shall be maintained thereafter to the extent that the tax proceeds authorized by this Article are sufficient to finance them.

(c) The tax imposed by this Article shall not be levied for any fiscal year of the City of Los Angeles in which year the City does not fund and employ at least 7,900 regular police officer positions.

(d) The Los Angeles City Council may provide for the collection of the special tax in the same manner and subject to the same penalties as, or with, other charges and taxes fixed and collected by the City, or by the County of Los Angeles on behalf of the City of Los Angeles. If the special tax is collected by the County on behalf of the City, the County may deduct its reasonable costs incurred for such service.

SEC. 21.17.5. SPECIAL POLICE TAX FUND.

(a) There is hereby established a special fund in the City Treasury entitled Special Police Tax Fund. The funds collected pursuant to this Article shall be placed in the Special Police Tax Fund to be used exclusively for the purpose for which the tax is imposed, and for no other purpose. Funds deposited in this special fund shall not be subject to reversion to the Reserve Fund, established under Charter Section 380. Nothing in this Section shall prevent the use of these funds to reimburse the General Fund when money is advanced from the General Fund to pay for the uses provided for in this Article. Except as otherwise provided in this Article, the Police Department shall administer the appropriated funds.

(b) If at the end of any fiscal year any unencumbered money raised by the Special Police Tax remains, it may be used in a succeeding fiscal year for the purposes stated in this Article. The existence of a surplus in any succeeding year shall be considered by the City Council when fixing the rates of tax for that succeeding year.

SEC. 21.17.6. TAX RATE.

(a) The tax imposed on each parcel, improvement to property, and use of property shall be computed for each parcel by applying a rate to the gross square footage area of any improvements on the parcel. If there are no improvements on a parcel, the tax shall be computed by applying the rate established for improvements to 500 square feet regardless of the size of the parcel. Commencing with fiscal year 1993-94, and for each succeeding fiscal year, the City Council, by ordinance, shall impose a rate applicable to unimproved parcels and, for each parcel upon which there is an improvement to property, shall impose a rate applicable to the gross square footage area of such improvements, regardless of the use of the parcel or improvements. The rate shall be established to provide revenue for each fiscal year sufficient to pay the estimated costs to be incurred by the City during that fiscal year for the additional police protection authorized by this Article. The City Council, in setting the rate, shall consider possible delinquencies in payments, so that the amount expected to be collected net of delinquencies will be sufficient to meet the estimated costs.

(b) Commencing with the 1993-94 fiscal year, and for each succeeding fiscal year, the maximum tax rate for the area of improvements on the parcel shall be \$4.89 per one hundred gross square feet of improvement area or fraction thereof.

(c) The maximum tax rate established in subsection (b) shall be adjusted annually, commencing with the 1993-94 fiscal year, for changes in the cost of living under the same procedures required for Los Angeles City Charter Section 355(3).

(d) For any fiscal year the City Council may, by ordinance, adjust the tax rate below the maximum amount; however, in no case shall the amount

of the tax rate to be levied exceed the maximum amount established by this Article without the approval of the voters by a two-thirds majority. Such a reduction shall not prevent a subsequent levy of taxes for any succeeding fiscal year up to the limits set forth in this Section.

SEC. 21.17.7. ADJUSTMENTS AND REFUNDS.

(a) Requests for adjustments involving imposition of this tax may be filed with the City Clerk. Upon sufficient evidence of error in the computation of the tax the City Clerk or a designee of the City Clerk shall cause the tax to be recalculated, and shall so advise the Los Angeles County Tax Assessor or other appropriate official.

(b) Whenever it is alleged that the amount of any tax has been overpaid or paid more than once or has been erroneously or illegally collected or received by the City under this Article, the refund procedure shall be as follows:

1. No claim for refund shall be allowed in whole or in part unless filed with the City Clerk within a period of three years from the date of the claimed overpayment, and all such claims for refund of the amount of the overpayment must be filed on forms furnished, and in the manner prescribed, by the City Clerk. Refunds may be made from the Special Police Tax Fund.

2. In the event the City Clerk or the City Council denies the claim, the City Clerk shall notify the claimant pursuant to California Government Code Section 913.

(c) The City Clerk shall have the same power to compromise claims involving the Special Police Tax, and the same power to accept and record underpayments or overpayments of such tax, as is granted to the City Clerk under subsections (f) and (g) of Section 21.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code with respect to Business Taxes. The City Clerk shall have the same authority to make refunds of this tax as is provided in Section 22.13 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

(d) If the County of Los Angeles does not attempt to collect any tax due under this Article, then the City Clerk shall have the power and duty to enforce all of the provisions of this Article. In such cases the City Clerk may make an assessment for taxes not paid against the owner of a parcel and improvements, or the owner of improvements on another's land; in the manner provided in Section 21.16 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

(e) The Special Police Tax shall be due in two equal installments in accordance with the collection procedures of the Los Angeles County Tax Collector with the first installment due November 1st and the second installment due February 1st in each fiscal year. The owner of the land, land and improvements, or improvements, at the time set forth in California Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 405 and 2192 for each fiscal year, shall have a personal obligation to the City of Los Angeles until the tax is paid for each fiscal year.

SEC. 21.17.8. SUBMISSION TO VOTERS.

The ordinance enacting this Article shall be submitted to the voters of the City of Los Angeles. The taxes determined and proposed by this Article shall be levied only if the ordinance is approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the voters voting. If the ordinance is approved by the requisite number of voters the Article shall thereafter be considered a part of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Amendments to procedural provisions of this Article may be made by ordinance adopted by the City Council.

SEC. 21.17.9. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

If any section, subsection, part, clause, sentence or phrase of this Article or the application thereof is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, the validity of the remaining portions of the Article, the application thereof, and the tax imposed shall not be affected thereby but shall remain in full force and effect, it being the intention of the City Council and the voters to adopt each and every section, subsection, part, clause, sentence or phrase regardless of whether any other section, subsection, part, clause, sentence or phrase or the application thereof is held to be invalid or unconstitutional.

2

TWO-TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS FOR TERMS STARTING ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 1993. CHARTER AMENDMENT 2.

Shall the City of Los Angeles Charter be amended to provide that the Mayor, City Attorney, Controller and members of the City Council shall each be limited to two terms of office, for terms starting on or after July 1, 1993?

IMPARTIAL SUMMARY

BY WILLIAM R. MCCARLEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

This Charter amendment would limit to two the number of terms that anyone could serve as Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller or member of the City Council. This measure would apply to all terms in office which begin on or after July 1, 1993. All current office holders would be eligible for re-election for up to two more terms.

The elective offices in the City of Los Angeles are the Mayor, the City Attorney, City Controller and member of the City Council. Persons are elected to these offices to serve four-year terms. The Offices of Mayor, City Attorney and City Controller are elected by the voters Citywide. Voters in each of the City's fifteen Council Districts elect one member of the Council.

The terms of the fifteen Council members are staggered so that the odd-numbered offices and the even-numbered offices alternate being filled every two years. For example, this year the City is holding elections to fill the eight odd-numbered Council offices. In 1995, elections will be held to select persons to fill the new terms for the even-numbered Council offices.

The offices of Mayor, City Attorney and City Controller are filled every four years at the same time as the odd-numbered Council offices and are therefore up for election this year.

There is no limit on the number of terms that a person can hold the same Citywide office or serve as a member of the City Council.

This Charter amendment would limit the number of terms that anyone could serve in the same elective City office. This limitation would apply to all terms in office which begin on or after July 1, 1993.

Under this new limitation, anyone currently holding a Citywide office would be eligible to serve up to two more terms in that office. Those currently serving on the City Council would also be eligible for re-election to the Council for a maximum of two more terms.

Application of this limit to persons elected to fill future vacancies that may be created when an official leaves office before the end of a term would depend on how much time remains in the unexpired term. A person elected to fill an unexpired term that is less than one-half of a full term

would be eligible for election to two additional terms in that office. If more than one-half of the term remains, the person would only be eligible for re-election to one additional term in that office.

This measure is similar to Proposition 4 on this ballot which also proposes term limits for elective City offices. If this measure, Proposition 2, and Proposition 4 are both approved by the voters, the measure receiving the highest number of yes votes will become law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BY KEITH COMRIE, CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This measure is not expected to result in any additional cost to the City.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

Why term limits?

Many people believe that term limits are an idea whose time has come. Along with fairer press coverage of elections and campaign finance reform, term limits are one idea to clean up government. Government must be cleaned up, but it must be done in a way that is fair to all citizens of this city.

The state legislature has term limits of its own. It is obvious that term limits have not reduced state government gridlock.

How did Charter Amendment 4 get on the ballot?

Riordan paid people to get 306,000 signatures. He used the initiative process to gain public and press recognition — something he argues is impossible without term limits.

Why did the City Council repeatedly vote against term limits?

Council members did not vote for term limits for two reasons. First, they feel that citizens should have the right to make their own decisions about their candidates. Second, they felt it would be hypocritical to impose a two term limit when their constituents had voted for them for over eight years. These voters know that some problems take longer than eight years to solve.

The Council submitted Charter Amendment 2 — despite philosophical objections to term limits — to equitably apply term limits to all elected officials.

Why Charter Amendment 2 instead of Charter Amendment 4?

Charter Amendment 2 will not divide our City's elected officials into two distinct classes: one group with a single term limit and the other group with a two term limit. Whether term limits are a good idea or not, any proposal establishing them should satisfy at least one minimum standard — it should be fair.

The very parts of the city which need constant attention and consistently effective elected representation would be the very parts hurt by Charter Amendment 4.

Charter Amendment 2 is the only measure which applies term limits fairly.

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Councilmember
8th District

LINDA GRIEGO
Former Deputy Mayor
City of Los Angeles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

ADDITIONAL PERSONS SIGNING ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

OLIVER B. GARVER, JR.
Retired Suffragan Bishop
Diocese of Los Angeles

JOHN FERRARO
President
Los Angeles City Council

ALLEN I. FREEHLING
Rabbi
University Synagogue

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Councilmember
5th District

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

As the argument in "support" of Charter Amendment 2 makes clear, **the City Hall politicians don't want term limits**. They have sponsored Charter Amendment 2 solely to confuse the voters and preserve their control of City Hall.

The more than 12,000 volunteers who joined me in support of Charter Amendment 4 know that **the people demand term limits for City Hall politicians**. To give the City the direction it needs, we must end the reign of career politicians.

Don't be confused by the career politicians fighting to preserve their power.

VOTE NO ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 2, THE WEAK TERM
LIMITS MEASURE SPONSORED BY THE POLITICIANS.

VOTE YES ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4, THE STRONG TERM
LIMITS MEASURE SPONSORED BY THE PEOPLE.

RICHARD J. RIORDAN
Chairman.
Citizens for L.A. Term Limits

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

If you want term limits, I urge you to vote NO on Charter Amendment 2, the politicians' measure, and YES on Charter Amendment 4, the people's measure.

Last July, I asked the City Council on three separate occasions to place a term limits measure on the ballot. They refused each time.

Because of the City Council inaction, our committee, Citizens for L.A. Term Limits, worked even harder to gather enough signatures to place our own measure on the ballot.

While the City Council did nothing on the issue for six months, the committee, with the help of over 12,000 volunteers, collected a record 306,000 signatures from the people of Los Angeles.

When the City Council realized our measure would qualify, the City Council placed its own competing measure, Charter Amendment 2, on the ballot. In this way, the politicians could suddenly claim to support term limits.

The City Council's measure, Charter Amendment 2, however, is a weaker version of term limits that would delay term limits for half the City Council.

Thousands of volunteers helped collect, and hundreds of thousands of citizens signed, petitions to place Charter Amendment 4 on the ballot. We cannot allow the City Council to undercut their efforts by sponsoring a weaker term limits measure designed to confuse voters.

I urge you to:

VOTE NO ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 2, THE POLITICIANS'
WEAK TERM LIMITS MEASURE

VOTE YES ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4, THE PEOPLE'S
STRONG TERM LIMITS MEASURE

RICHARD J. RIORDAN
Chairman
Citizens for L.A. Term Limits

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

Charter Amendment 2 is a stronger measure because it is fairer and more effective.

Charter Amendment 2 applies term limits fairly by setting the same starting point for the term limit of all elected officials.

There is nothing confusing about that.

Charter Amendment 2 supports the people's desire for term limits while preventing inequity.

There is nothing weak about that.

Charter Amendment 4 will harm the citizens of the City because it will not bring the effective reform that the public demands.

Do not let big money masquerade as "the will of the people." It is Riordan, not the City Council, who is trying to confuse the public on the issue of effective political reform.

VOTE NO ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4.

**VOICE YOUR OPINION ON TERM LIMITS — ON EQUITABLY APPLIED
TERM LIMITS — WITH CHARTER AMENDMENT 2.**

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Councilmember
8th District

New provisions or language added to the Charter or to existing Charter sections are shown in boldface type; words deleted from the Charter or from existing Charter sections are shown in strikeout type.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 2

**PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT ON TWO-TERM
LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS FOR
TERMS STARTING ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 1993**

Section 1. A new Section 7.5 is hereby added to the Charter of the City of Los Angeles to read as follows:

Sec. 7.5. No person may serve more than two terms of office as Mayor. No person may serve more than two terms of office as City Attorney. No person may serve more than two terms of office as Controller. No person may serve more than two terms of office as member of the City Council. These limitations on the number of terms of office shall apply only to terms of office which begin on or after July 1, 1993. These limitations on the number of terms of office shall not apply to any unexpired term to which a person is elected or appointed if the remainder of the term is less than one-half of the full term of office.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

3

FIRE AND POLICE PENSION SYSTEMS. CHARTER AMENDMENT 3.

Shall the Charter be amended to permit the recall of retired Los Angeles Police Officers to active duty without loss of pension for a period not to exceed 12 months, the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment for such recalled members to be established by ordinance?

IMPARTIAL SUMMARY

BY WILLIAM R. MCCARLEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

This Charter amendment would create a new process under which retired police officers could be recalled to active duty for limited periods of time.

Under the current Charter, a retired police officer may apply to the Chief of Police for a return to active duty if the following conditions are met: the officer retired at a rank no higher than Sergeant; has been retired for no longer than three years; is under the age of 55; and has passed the required physical exam. If the request is approved, the pension which the officer had been receiving while retired will terminate at the same time that the officer returns to active duty. However, the reactivated officer will accrue additional retirement credit for years served after reactivation.

In addition, the Chief of Police currently has the authority to recall retired police officers to voluntary active duty for periods not to exceed 90 days. Any officer who accepts such recall may only return to the rank held at the time of retirement, and may not serve for more than 90 days in any one calendar year. There is no interruption of a retired officer's pension payment during this period of service as a recalled officer.

This proposed Charter amendment would give the Chief of Police the authority to recall retired officers for periods in excess of 90 days, but not longer than twelve consecutive months. The salary, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment for any such recalled officer would be established by the Mayor and City Council by ordinance. As with the Police Chief's current recall authority, there would be no interruption in the retired officer's pension payment during this period of service as a recalled officer.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BY KEITH COMRIE, CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This measure authorizes retired police officers to be recalled to active duty for up to 12 months, without a loss of pension. An ordinance would be required to establish the salary and benefits of these recalled officers. If an ordinance is adopted, the financial impact would be minimal because recalled officers would be utilized primarily to occupy vacant positions already funded in the budget, until such time as new officers could be hired.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 3

I urge the voters to vote yes on Charter Amendment 3. Charter Amendment 3 will permit the City to recall police officers to active duty up to 12 months by mutual agreement. The Los Angeles Police Department has lost well-qualified and experienced police officers to early retirement. These officers will then either go into business for themselves or be lost to other local municipalities.

The problem is the taxpayers spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to train and to prepare police officers for active duty and when they become seasoned officers they opt to leave. They opt to leave when we desperately need them the most. We need well-trained police officers who are experienced in combatting gang violence, apprehending drug dealers and in making our streets and communities safe for law abiding citizens. The City is losing too many police officers to early retirement. We must take positive and corrective action to turn that around.

Charter Amendment 3 will provide a window of opportunity to re-hire these police officers at a savings to the taxpayers. This program will provide a savings of roughly 48% of the original salary of the police officers prior to their retirement. The City will not be required to pay for medical or pension benefits for the re-hired police officers.

In June 1991, we budgeted for a staff of 8,400 police officers. Currently, we are budgeted for 7,900 police officers. However, due to early retirement, we only have 7,750. Crime is going up not down! YOU AS A VOTER HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO CORRECT THE PROBLEM OF RISING CRIME. VOTE TO RE-HIRE THE RETIRED POLICE OFFICER AT A SAVINGS TO THE TAXPAYERS.

Please join with me, the Wilshire Chamber of Commerce, homeowner and taxpayer associations and vote yes on Charter Amendment 3.

NATE HOLDEN
Councilmember
10th District

RICHARD MC DERMOTT
President
Wilshire Chamber of Commerce

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST THIS MEASURE WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 3

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT ON FIRE AND POLICE PENSION SYSTEMS

Section 1. Subdivisions (3) through (6) of Subsection (B) of Section 181.1 of the Los Angeles City Charter are hereby amended to read:

(3) The Chief may recall a retired member to active duty: (a) only in or to a vacant position in the rank held by him at the effective date of his original retirement; ~~and (b) for not to exceed 90 days in any one calendar year; and (c) the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment of any such recalled member shall be as provided under Paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (B) herein.~~

(4) Recall of retired members of the Police Department may be approved for a period in excess of 90 days but not for more than 12 consecutive months, without loss of pension, in which case the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment for such recalled, police officers shall be established by ordinance.

~~(4)~~ (5) A retired member, if he were to be recalled to active duty, thereafter shall be known as a "recalled member" and, as such:

(a) His recall to active duty shall be a privilege only and the Chief may terminate his service at any time;

(b) His pension shall be paid during the period of his recall to active duty;

(c) He shall be paid (I) the salary provided for his rank and (II) the longevity pay or merit pay provided for his aggregate years of service prior to the effective date of his original retirement;

(d) He shall have no deductions made for pension purposes, pursuant to Section 186 1/2, from his salary and longevity pay or merit pay; and

(e) He, his widow, his minor child or children or his dependent parent or parents never shall be entitled to any pension benefits provided by this Article or Article XVIII by reason of his service as a recalled member.

~~(5)~~ (6) The provisions of this Article hereafter shall be construed and applied, as to a recalled member, his widow, his minor child or children and his dependent parent or parents, in accordance with respectively applicable provisions of Paragraph (5) of this subsection of this section.

Sec. 2. Subdivisions (3) through (6) of Subsection (B) of Section 190.111 of the Los Angeles City Charter are hereby amended to read:

(3) The Chief may recall a retired member to active duty: (a) only in or to a vacant position in the rank held by him at the effective date of his original retirement; ~~and (b) for not to exceed 90 days in any one calendar year; and (c) the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment of any such recalled member shall be as provided under Paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (B) herein.~~

(4) Recall of retired members of the Police Department may be approved for a period in excess of 90 days but not for more than 12 consecutive months, without loss of pension, in which case the salary, benefits and other terms and conditions of employment for such recalled police officers shall be established by ordinance.

~~(4)~~ (5) A retired member, if he were to be recalled to active duty, thereafter shall be known as a "recalled member" and, as such:

(a) His recall to active duty shall be a privilege only and the Chief may terminate his service at any time;

(b) His pension shall be paid during the period of his recall to active duty;

(c) He shall be paid (I) the salary provided for his rank and (II) the longevity pay or merit pay provided for his aggregate years of service prior to the effective date of his original retirement;

(d) He shall have no deductions made for pension purposes, pursuant to Section 190.10, from his salary and longevity pay or merit pay; and

(e) He, his surviving spouse, his minor child or children or dependent child or children or his dependent parent or parents never shall be entitled to any pension benefits provided by this Article or Article XVII by reason of his service as a recalled member.

~~(5)~~ (6) The provisions of this Article hereafter shall be construed and applied, as to a recalled member, his surviving spouse, his minor child or children or dependent child or children and his dependent parent or parents, in accordance with respectively applicable provisions of Paragraph (5) of this subsection of this section.

4

INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT — TWO-TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS. CHARTER AMENDMENT 4.

Shall the City of Los Angeles Charter be amended to provide that the Mayor, City Attorney, Controller and members of the City Council shall each be limited to two terms of office, for terms starting on or after July 1, 1993, except that an incumbent Councilmember whose office is not on the ballot in 1993 could serve only one additional term?

IMPARTIAL SUMMARY

BY WILLIAM R. MCCARLEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

This Charter amendment would limit to two the number of terms that anyone could serve as Mayor, City Attorney, City Controller or member of the City Council. This measure would apply to all terms in office which begin on or after July 1, 1993. Those currently holding a Council office which will be up for re-election in two years would only be eligible to serve one more term. All other current office holders would be eligible for re-election for up to two more terms.

The elective offices in the City of Los Angeles are the Mayor, the City Attorney, City Controller and member of the City Council. Persons are elected to these offices to serve four-year terms. The Offices of Mayor, City Attorney and City Controller are elected by the voters Citywide. Voters in each of the City's fifteen Council Districts elect one member of the Council.

The terms of the fifteen Council members are staggered so that the odd-numbered offices and the even-numbered offices alternate being filled every two years. For example, this year the City is holding elections to fill the eight odd-numbered Council offices. In 1995, elections will be held to select persons to fill the new terms for the even-numbered Council offices.

The offices of Mayor, City Attorney and City Controller are filled every four years at the same time as the odd-numbered Council offices and are therefore up for election this year.

There is no limit on the number of terms that a person can hold the same Citywide office or serve as a member of the City Council.

This Charter amendment would limit the number of terms that anyone could serve in the same elective City office. This limitation would apply to all terms in office which begin on or after July 1, 1993.

Under this new limitation, anyone currently holding a Citywide office would be eligible to serve up to two more terms in that office. Those currently serving on the City Council representing the odd-numbered districts would be eligible for re-election to the Council for a maximum of two more terms. Those members representing the even-numbered districts would only be eligible to serve one additional term.

Application of this limit to persons elected to fill future vacancies that may be created when an official leaves office before the end of a term would depend on how much time remains in the unexpired term. A person elected to fill an unexpired term that is less than one-half of the full term would be eligible for election to two additional terms in that office. If more than one-half of the term remains, the person would only be eligible for re-election to one additional term in that office.

This measure is similar to Proposition 2 on this ballot which also proposes term limits for elective City offices. If this measure, Proposition 4, and Proposition 2 are both approved by the voters, the measure receiving the highest number of yes votes will become law.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BY KEITH COMRIE, CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This measure is not expected to result in any additional cost to the City.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

I feel the best way for me to present an argument in favor of **Charter Amendment 4** would be to share some of the questions that I have been asked about term limits.

Q: Why Term Limits?

RIORDAN: Today more than 95% of the city's elected officials are reelected. In my view, the City Hall politicians aren't getting reelected because they're doing the best job possible for the citizens of Los Angeles; they are getting reelected because, as incumbents, they are able to more successfully raise money from special interest groups and better able to get their name in the newspaper.

We need new and fresh ideas, and the system doesn't give enough talented people the chance to participate in government.

Q: Will government be effective if experienced politicians are prohibited from running for more than two terms?

RIORDAN: I don't believe politics should be a career, and I think having career politicians creates more problems than it solves. I am convinced that politicians who are in office for too long lose touch with the concerns of the average citizen. We need people in office who have made a payroll, taught in schools, or had to deal with the unresponsive government bureaucracy.

If **Charter Amendment 4** passes, the reign of the career politician will end, and the era of the citizen-politician will begin.

Q: Why did the City Council repeatedly vote against your proposal to put term limits on the ballot last year?

RIORDAN: Despite overwhelming popular support for term limits, a majority of the members of the City Council said they didn't see the need for term limits. In reality, they didn't want term limits because term limits would reduce their power and loosen their lock on City Hall.

By originally refusing to place term limits on the ballot last year, the City Hall politicians decided to put their interests ahead of the interests of the people.

Q: How did term limits get on the ballot?

RIORDAN: Last year I asked the City Council on three occasions to place a term limits measure on the ballot. A majority of the City Council repeatedly refused. In response to the City Hall inaction, we worked harder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4 (CON'T)

to put our term limits measure on the ballot. More than 12,000 voters volunteered to help me circulate petitions, and we turned in over 306,000 signatures of voters in Los Angeles to put term limits on the ballot. This is incredible because an average of only 212,000 voters turned out to vote in the last four city elections.

Q: What happened then?

RIORDAN: When the City Council saw the magnitude of our efforts, they decided they had to do something. Some city councilmembers wanted to pretend they favored term limits. They placed a competing Charter Amendment on the ballot, but their measure, Charter Amendment 2, doesn't go far enough and would delay term limits for half the City Council.

Q: Why Charter Amendment 4 instead of the City Council's Charter Amendment 2?

RIORDAN: The City Council's measure would delay term limits for roughly half of the City Council. Passage of either term limits measure would be a victory for the people, but **YES on Charter Amendment 4** and **NO on Charter Amendment 2**, means the stronger term limits measure passes.

I am very proud of the efforts of the citizens of Los Angeles to qualify this **Charter Amendment 4** for the ballot, and I thank all of you reading this who signed our petitions last year. Working together, we must pass **Charter Amendment 4**, change the way things are done in City Hall, begin a process of much needed reform and build a better Los Angeles.

I URGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4.

RICHARD J. RIORDAN
Chairman
Citizens for L.A. Term Limits

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

Question: *Why is Charter Amendment 4 a bad idea?*

Rebuttal: Riordan's initiative is a false prescription for the problems facing Los Angeles. It seeks to protect voters from ourselves by limiting our choice and taking from us the freedom to choose the leaders we want.

Riordan himself belies his assertion that incumbents are advantaged because they can more easily raise money from special interest groups and are better able to get their name in the newspaper.

The probability that 'getting the rascals out' will change the way things are done is overshadowed by reality. A career in private life often carries just as much special interest baggage and conflicts of interest as one spent in public service. Public finance reform is a better option for reform because it provides challengers the basic amount of funds they need to gain name recognition and become competitive.

Better press coverage of lesser-known candidates before elections and campaign finance reform, not term limits, will guarantee fairer elections.

Question: *Will government be effective if experienced politicians are prohibited from running for more than two terms?*

Rebuttal: Not necessarily. Many believe that with term limits, the voters may become more complacent, as term limits will take away the responsibility of the voter to make decisions wisely. It should be up to the voters to end the careers of politicians, and maintain the careers of those who have served the city well. Some problems in this city will take longer than eight years to solve.

In fact, newly elected public officials often fall prey to lobbyists as they are not as experienced with many issues as seasoned elected officials. Term limits will turn lobbyists into career politicians—away from the scrutiny of the public eye.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4 (CON'T)

Question: *How did term limits get on the ballot?*

Rebuttal: Those who signed their name to get this issue on the ballot deserve great praise. The efforts of these 306,000 voters have been heard.

Yet grass roots initiatives do not guarantee fair public policy. Since this Charter Amendment was originally directed at curtailing the term of the Mayor, many signed this Charter Amendment without the knowledge that it applies term limits to Council members unfairly.

Do not let Riordan's use of the initiative process to grab headlines for his political aspirations unfairly affect the constituents of this City.

Los Angeles has just passed public finance regulations that have been upheld by the courts. Let us give that a chance and not lock ourselves into a system of governance that may end up forcing out elected officials to be more reliant on special interests, or empower lobbyists and general managers which are not subject to the accountability of the voters.

Please do not let the desire for term limits undercut the power of the public voice.

VOTE NO ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4.

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Councilmember
8th District

MARIA ELENA DURAZO
Local 11, AFL-CIO
Hotel & Restaurant Employees
Union

RITA WALTERS
Councilmember
9th District

XANDRA KAYDEN
Visiting Scholar
Center for Politics and Policy
Claremont Graduate School

RABBI STEVEN JACOBS
Founder
New Reform Congregation
of Encino

DORIS ISOLINI NELSON
Community Activist

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

**ADDITIONAL PERSONS SIGNING THE REBUTTAL TO THE
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4**

CONNIE RICE
Western Regional Counsel
NAACP Legal Defense and
Educational Fund, Inc.

DR. THOMAS KILGORE
Pastor Emeritus
Second Baptist Church of
Los Angeles

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

Although Charter Amendment 4 and the City's alternative term limit measure seem virtually the same, they are widely divergent in terms of fairness in treatment to all City elected officials and the voters they represent.

This measure — Charter Amendment 4 is not fair and should be rejected.

Charter Amendment 4 would limit the current incumbents from even-numbered Council districts to a maximum of one more term, while the incumbents from odd-numbered districts would have the opportunity for two more terms. However, Councilmembers of odd-numbered districts have been in office an average of over 15 years, while even-numbered Councilmembers have been in office an average of 10 years. Under Charter Amendment 4 the Councilmembers who have enjoyed the longest period of service get to stay in office longer.

In short, Charter Amendment 4 does not make good sense.

Why punish Council members of even-numbered districts with the opportunity for only one more term, when incumbents from odd-numbered districts do not receive this same treatment? This is no way to acquire political reform.

The recent implementation of laws substantially changing campaign financing have not had a chance to prove their effectiveness. Since future municipal elections should be more financially equitable to opposing candidates, why discriminate against even-numbered council districts in an attempt to attain campaign reform?

Charter Amendment 4 is not good public policy.

Whether you agree or disagree with the concept of term limits, we urge you to vote NO on Charter Amendment 4.

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Councilmember
8th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

Don't be confused. The only difference between our term limit proposal, Charter Amendment 4, and the City Council's, Charter Amendment 2, is that theirs gives seven councilmembers an additional four years at City Hall — delaying change and the new leadership that would bring fresh ideas and renewed energy to the problems facing Los Angeles.

While we understand the complaints by even-numbered councilmembers, the City Council has had ample opportunity to debate and propose equitable term limits, as well as address the need for civil service reform for department heads to make top bureaucrats more accountable. Instead, the City Council rejected reforms for City Hall bureaucrats and placed its own term limits measure on the ballot to confuse voters, . . . and only after Citizens for L.A. Term Limits' initiative had qualified.

Over half the City Council has served more than a decade — some more than two decades — in office; these incumbent politicians have promoted the status quo rather than change and reform. The people of Los Angeles deserve better than "status quo" government . . . our problems can't wait.

Don't be confused.

VOTE "YES" ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 4, the PEOPLE'S MEASURE.

VOTE "NO" ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 2, the POLITICIAN'S MEASURE.

MIKE HERNANDEZ
Councilmember
1st District

RICHARD J. RIORDAN
Chairman
Citizens for L.A. Term Limits

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

New provisions or language added to the Charter or to existing Charter sections are shown in **boldface type**; words deleted from the Charter or from existing Charter sections are shown in ~~strikeout type~~.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 4

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT ON INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT — TWO-TERM LIMITS FOR ELECTED CITY OFFICERS

Section 1. A new Section 7.5 is hereby added to the Charter of the City of Los Angeles to read as follows:

Sec. 7.5. No person may serve more than two terms as Mayor. No person may serve more than two terms as City Attorney. No person may serve more than two terms as Controller. No person may serve more than two terms as a member of the City Council.

These limitations on the number of terms apply only to terms which begin on or after July 1, 1993 except that an incumbent member of the City Council whose office is not on the ballot in 1993 may serve only one additional term instead of the two terms provided for. The limitations shall not apply to any unexpired term to which a person is elected or appointed if the remainder of the term is less than one-half of the full term.

If any provision of this initiative measure or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid or unenforceable, that invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect other provisions or applications of the measure which reasonably can be given effect without the invalid or unenforceable provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this measure are severable.

**5 CHANGE IN THE AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD OF
ANIMAL REGULATION COMMISSIONERS.
CHARTER AMENDMENT 5.**

Shall the Charter be amended to change the Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners from an advisory board to a board which operates as the head of the Department of Animal Regulation?

IMPARTIAL SUMMARY

BY WILLIAM R. MCCARLEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

This Charter amendment would change the Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners from an advisory board to a board which operates as the head of the Animal Regulation Department.

The Animal Regulation Department has the responsibility to enforce City and other laws which relate to the care, treatment, and impounding of animals, as well as the prevention of cruelty to animals. The Department also maintains a system of animal shelters and enforces City laws regarding the licensing of animals.

The Animal Regulation Department is one of several departments of City government that are established under Charter Section 70. In addition to creating these departments, Charter Section 70 also specifies the function that each of the department's boards of commissioners will serve. Some of these departments are under the control and management of their commission. In other departments, the commission is only an advisory body with the department under the control and management of a general manager.

In each of the departments, the board is composed of five members, each of whom is appointed and may be removed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the City Council. These are part-time positions and board members are appointed for six year terms.

Charter Section 70 currently places the City's Department of Animal Regulation under the control and management of its General Manager who is appointed by the Mayor, subject to the civil service provisions of the Charter and confirmation by the City Council. The Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners is an advisory board only.

This Charter amendment would change the role of the Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners. This amendment would change the Board of Animal Regulation Commissioners from an advisory board and instead place the control and management of the Animal Regulation Department under its Commission.

FINANCIAL IMPACT STATEMENT

BY KEITH COMRIE, CITY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This measure would result in minor cost increases including increasing the compensation of the Commissioners from \$25 per meeting to \$50 per meeting and increased administrative costs associated with the preparation of staff reports for Commission review.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 5

For over twenty years, city bureaucrats have run our animal shelters into the ground. Instead of saving animals, they kill them. Instead of accepting offers from kind citizens to help, they turn them away. Instead of rational and humane management of our animal shelters, we have inhumanity and incompetence.

Charter Amendment 5 will put an end to this bureaucratic waste, inefficiency and inhumanity.

Measure 5 will empower a citizen's commission to oversee the Animal Regulation department to make sure the bureaucrats, whose salaries we pay, do their job and do it right.

The professional politicians and bureaucrats who oppose Measure 5 want you to believe that ordinary citizens will meddle in the day to day affairs of the Animal Regulation Department.

Nonsense.

All Measure 5 will do is allow for citizen review and oversight of departmental policies and operations — letting the professionals do their jobs.

We have it in our power to end needless animal deaths. And we have it in our power to correct the abuses that have existed for over 20 years.

Vote YES on Charter Amendment 5.

RUTH GALANTER
Councilmember
6th District

MIKE HERNANDEZ
Councilmember
1st District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 5

That too many animals are euthanized because no one wants them is a sad fact. But shelter workers do not choose to kill them.

Owners and the public have an opportunity to redeem impounded strays. Animals are held for seven days, often longer. But they cannot be kept indefinitely because of lack of space and cost. Nor can the City release them to irresponsible persons.

We must not allow misleading, emotional appeals to obscure the fact that it is careless pet owners, who let their unaltered animals run loose, that are responsible for the huge overpopulation of cats and dogs.

We must do everything possible to encourage spaying and neutering of pets, so as to reduce the surplus of animals which otherwise have to be destroyed.

Destroying the professional management of the Department will not save the life of a single, unwanted stray.

Vote NO on Charter Amendment 5.

ROBERT I. RUSH
General Manager (Retired)
Animal Regulation Department

TOM BRADLEY
Mayor
City of Los Angeles

ANTON CALLEIA
Chief Executive Assistant
to the Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 5

This proposal would transfer responsibility for the management of the Animal Regulation Department from a professional General Manager, answerable to the Mayor and City Council, to a part-time citizen board which typically meets only twice a month.

Today the General Manager, who is appointed under civil service rules by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the City Council, has direct responsibility to hire, direct and discipline all departmental employees. Under the proposed Charter amendment, the General Manager would be appointed by the Board of Commissioners and all his/her administrative duties would be subject to instructions of the part-time commission.

In 1965, after careful review by the non-partisan League of Women Voters, and upon the recommendation of several business and university studies, the management of the Animal Regulation Department and several other municipal agencies was transferred from a part-time board of commissioners to a full-time, professionally trained general manager in order to increase the efficiency of departmental operations and improve its responsiveness to public needs. The citizen commissioners were continued as an advisory board to the General Manager. Thus, the proposed Charter amendment would be a step backward.

Under the present system, the General Manager is appointed by the Mayor, subject to City Council confirmation, and may be removed by the Mayor for cause with the concurrence of the City Council. The proposed Charter amendment would abolish this time-proven method for holding the General Manager directly accountable to the Mayor and the City Council. The existing procedure is a source of strength for our City government and protects against the encroachment of the spoils system.

For these reasons we strongly urge you to vote NO on this proposed Charter amendment.

TOM BRADLEY
Mayor
City of Los Angeles

ELDRIDGE HUNTINGTON
Animal Regulation Commissioner
City of Los Angeles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT 5

Charter Amendment 5 will bring accountability to the Animal Regulation Department and better treatment for our pets.

Animal Regulation is an example of how bad management can be entrenched for decades, unfairly protected from public scrutiny by outdated Charter provisions. Measure 5 is designed to change that.

The mayor's argument against it MISLEADS voters by implying that no other City departments are run by citizen commissions. The truth is that 9 of the City's 17 departments are already headed by commissions, including 6 that are also subject to direct mayoral and Council control.

The mayor's "one size fits all" approach to city government is rigid and out of date. He believes that bureaucrats should take precedence over people (and animals) in the Department of Animal Regulation.

Animal Regulation needs a hand from the people to get back on track and stay on track!

VOTE YES ON CHARTER AMENDMENT 5.

RUTH GALANTER
Councilmember
6th District

MIKE HERNANDEZ
Councilmember
1st District

CAMILLE "MIMI" ROBINS
Commissioner
Board of Animal Regulation

JAIME VELASCO
Commissioner
Board of Animal Regulation

LYLENE WEISS
Acting President
Los Angeles League
of Conservation Voters

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and are not checked for accuracy by any City agency.

New provisions or language added to the Charter or to existing Charter sections are shown in **boldface** type; words deleted from the Charter or from existing Charter sections are shown in ~~strikeout~~ type.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT 5
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT ON CHANGE IN THE
AUTHORITY OF ANIMAL REGULATION COMMISSIONERS**

Subsections (b) and (c) of Section 70 of the Charter of the City of Los Angeles are hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) Animal Regulation

Personnel

Fire

Police

Said departments shall each be under the control and management of a board of five commissioners.

(c) ~~Animal Regulation~~

Building and Safety

City Planning

Health

Municipal Arts

Public Utilities and Transportation

Social Service

Traffic

Said departments shall each be under the control and management of a general manager.

Each of these departments shall have a board of commissioners to exercise the powers and perform the duties provided for in this Charter.

**CASSETTE RECORDINGS OF THE
VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET**

Cassette recordings of the City measures included in this voter information pamphlet are available for use by blind voters at city branch libraries. Please call (213) 612-3200 for more information on the city branch library nearest you.

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK — ELECTION DIVISION
VOTER INFORMATION**

Absent Voter Ballots

(213) 485-4615

If you are unable or do not wish to vote at your polling place on Election Day, you may apply for an Absent Voter Ballot using the application found on the back cover of your Official Sample Ballot. The deadline for applying for an Absent Voter Ballot is 7 days prior to Election Day. Once you have received and voted your Absent Voter Ballot, you must return it to the City Clerk, in the envelope provided, with your signature and date on the envelope. All Absent Voter Ballots must be received by the City Clerk by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If you wish to vote by Absent Voter Ballot, you are strongly encouraged to send in your application as soon as you receive your Official Sample Ballot.

If you make an error in voting your Absent Voter Ballot, you may return it to the City Clerk for another one. If the time before Election Day is short, you may take your erroneously-marked Absent Voter Ballot to your polling place on Election Day, surrender it to the precinct board officers, and vote another ballot at the polls.

Physically Disabled Voters

(213) 485-9110

Every effort is made to select Polling Places on Election Day accessible to physically disabled voters. A small designation on the back cover of your Official Sample Ballot (next to your Polling Place address) shows if your Polling Place is accessible. However, any voter who cannot reach the Voting Booths because of architectural barriers or physical limitations may request to vote "curbside" — outside of the Polling Place. In such a case, a Precinct Board Member will bring a ballot and a vote recorder machine to the voter curbside, allow them to vote, and then place the voter's ballot in the ballot box.

Foreign Language Voter Assistance

1-(800) 994-VOTE

A new Federal law requires the City to provide voting materials in Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese and Tagalog. In addition, the Los Angeles City Council requires voting materials to be provided in Korean. If you are a qualified, registered voter who wishes to receive an Official Sample Ballot in any of the above languages, please call toll-free 1-800-994-VOTE. In addition, foreign language voters who need assistance at the polls in any of the above languages may bring along such assistance to the Polling Place. Foreign language voters may also call 1-800-994-VOTE from their Polling Place if they need voting assistance on Election Day.

VOTER INFORMATION (CON'T)

Polling Place Location

(213) 485-3581

Your polling place location is shown on the back cover of your Official Sample Ballot. Occasionally, a polling place will have to be changed at the last minute. Those registered voters affected by the change will be mailed a postcard showing the address of the new polling place. Polling places are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Registering to Vote

(213) 721-1100

U.S. Citizens who are 18 years old (or will be by Election Day) may register to vote by filling out a voter registration form and sending it to the Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder. Registration forms are available at most U.S. Post Offices, DMV Offices and local libraries. You must register to vote at least 29 days prior to an Election in order to be eligible to vote in that election. You must re-register to vote if you move your permanent address, change your name or wish to change your political party affiliation.

Precinct Board Officers

(213) 485-9110

For each City election, approximately 10,000 registered voters are recruited to serve as precinct board officers at polling places on Election Day. Pollworkers receive between \$45 and \$60 for their Election Day service, depending upon their duties.

Audio Cassette Recordings

(213) 612-3200

Audio cassette recordings of the City's Official Sample Ballot and Voter Information Pamphlet are available at City branch libraries approximately two weeks before Election Day. Visually-impaired and other interested voters may contact the City Library for more information.

Official Sample Ballot

(213) 485-7181

The City's Official Sample Ballot and Voter Information Pamphlet is mailed approximately three weeks prior to Election Day to every registered voter in the City and in the outlying Los Angeles Unified School and Community College Districts. While the Office of the City Clerk is responsible for assembling, printing and mailing the Official Sample Ballot, the City Clerk and his staff are not permitted to render opinions on candidates or measures.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

1. Do not return the form on the back cover if you have already requested an Absent Voter Ballot for this election.
2. A separate application is necessary for each person for each election.
3. Requests must be made in writing. Telephone applications are not acceptable.
4. Please apply immediately. **Applications must be received by the City Clerk by April 13, 1993.**
5. If you are unable to fill out this application or need additional information, call the Absent Voter Ballot Section at (213) 485-4615.

**WHEN REQUESTING AN ABSENT
VOTER BALLOT, USE APPLICATION
ON BACK COVER**



PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Place
Postage
Stamp
Here



RETURN ADDRESS

LOS ANGELES CITY CLERK
ELECTION DIVISION
PO BOX 54377
LOS ANGELES CA 90054-0377

